



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/650,051

08/26/2003

Stephan Limper

HK-769

7384

7590

07/31/2006

LERNER AND GREENBERG, P.A.
POST OFFICE BOX 2480
HOLLYWOOD, FL 33022-2480

EXAMINER

VALONE, THOMAS F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2858

DATE MAILED: 07/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/650,051	Applicant(s) LIMPER ET AL.	
	Examiner Thomas F. Valone	Art Unit 2858	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 12-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 12-16 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 17 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 May 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because the horizontal line separating the cable plug 36 and cable 38 in Figure 3B appears to be superimposed upon the line framing the sensor carrier 30. The Replacement Sheet for Amendment dated 04/27/2006 suffers from the same confusion and looks the same as the original drawing. Moving the line up or down slightly will visually separate the two parts. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Art Unit: 2858

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 – 9, 12, 14 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Menard (6,042,101).

Menard teaches an apparatus for detecting a material of a surface of a flat object on a stack of flat objects, the flat objects being printing plates (media plate M, Fig. 7A and col. 13, line 41), separated by interlayers (interleaf, col. 13, line 44) in the stack (cassette, col. 13, line 12) with a sensor apparatus (149, Fig. 7a) containing a sensor carrier (151, Fig. 7a), electronics (controller 21, col. 13, line 43), and electrodes (153, 155, Fig. 7a) resting on the surface of a flat object for conducting a measuring current through the surface of the flat object (col. 13, line 61), and the sensor electronics having an evaluation device for distinguishing between the printing plates and the interlayers (controller 21, col. 13, line 43), which reads on claims 1 and 12. Furthermore, Menard inherently includes a measurement of resistance and conductivity with his conductive paper sensor (149, Fig. 7a) which measures current flow (col. 13, line 60-65) thus anticipating claims 2 and 14.

Regarding claims 6 and 18, Menard teaches a surface detection of a flat object of metal and paper (col. 13, line 40-45).

Regarding claim 7, Menard teaches a loading device for printing plates and the sensor is integrated into the loading device (cassette, col. 13, line 12).

Art Unit: 2858

Regarding claim 8, the lifting and suction elements for gripping the printing plates with the lifting device integrated into the lifting device is taught by Menard (col. 14, line 38).

Regarding claims 5 and 9, Menard's conductive paper sensor detects the absence of an interleaf which may be on the underside of the metal media printing plate that would cause a short-circuit for the two-electrode sensors. Therefore, Menard inherently teaches a short-circuit detector as well.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menard in view of Pratt (5,899,313).

The teachings of Menard are reviewed above.

Menard does not teach varying a frequency of the measuring current using a controllable frequency generator; carrying out a plurality of measurements at different frequencies; and distinguishing a surface material by depending on the frequency of the voltage which is applied to the sensor electrodes.

Pratt, from an analogous field of endeavor, teaches varying a frequency of the measuring current (output of 741, Fig. 4) using a controllable frequency generator (Wein bridge oscillator, Fig. 4 and col. 4, line 11); carrying out a plurality of measurements at

Art Unit: 2858

different frequencies (col. 3, line 14); and distinguishing a surface material by depending on the frequency of the voltage (voltage controlled oscillator, col. 4, line 25) which is applied to the sensor electrodes (frequency capture range, col. 3, line 1-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a controllable frequency generator as suggested by Pratt to carry out a plurality of measurements at different frequencies in Menard's surface material sensor, for the benefit of distinguishing surface materials depending on the frequency of the voltage which is applied to the sensor electrodes.

6. Claims 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menard in view of Ganton of record.

Regarding claim 13, the teachings of Menard are reviewed above.

Menard does not teach measuring current with a frequency generator by applying high frequency voltage to the sensor electrodes. However, it is also well known in electrical circuit design that generating a measuring current is inherent and required to a measurement of voltage, especially to charge up capacitors and also, every current measurement necessitates a voltage measurement, as implied by claim 13.

Ganton, from the same field of endeavor, teaches a measuring current with a frequency generator by applying high frequency voltage to the sensor electrodes (1, Fig. 1). Ganton also uses an operational amplifier (7, Fig. 1) which is known in the art to only operate by measuring input current, no matter how small.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used Ganton's high frequency generator to generate a

Art Unit: 2858

measuring current by applying high voltage to sensor electrodes for detecting the material of a surface of a flat object since the high frequency impedance between surfaces varies widely, making detection easier.

Regarding claim 3, the teachings of Menard are reviewed above.

Menard does not explicitly teach sensor electrodes containing a frequency generator connected to them, a rectifier connected to the sensor electrodes, a measurement amplifier connected to the rectifier, comparators connected to the amplifier and an evaluation unit connected to the comparators.

Ganton teaches a frequency generator (1, Fig. 1) connected to sensor electrodes, a rectifier (8, Fig. 1), a measurement amplifier connected to the rectifier (11, Fig. 1) which is also a comparator. The evaluation unit is implicitly part of the sensor electronics since the comparator (11, Fig. 1) must output to some type of evaluation unit, as is well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used Ganton's frequency generator connected to sensor electrodes with rectifier and comparator amplifier for the purpose of evaluating the surface material of printing plates which may contain paper interlayers that need to be detected and removed efficiently.

7. Claims 4 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menard as modified by Ganton (M-G) as applied to claims 1 and 12 above, and further in view of Nakamura of record.

Regarding claim 4, the teachings of M-G are reviewed above, which include the sensor electronics containing a controllable-frequency generator connected to the sensor electrodes, a rectifier connected to the sensor electrodes and a measurement amplifier connected to the rectifier.

M-G does not teach an analog to digital converter connected to the amplifier and with the evaluation unit connected to the analog to digital converter (ADC).

Nakamura, from the same field of endeavor, teaches an ADC (74, Fig. 37 and col. 9, line 58) and a comparator evaluation unit (202, Fig. 37) connected to the ADC.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used Nakamura's ADC and evaluation unit with the sensor electronics of M-G for the purpose of digitizing the signal for better and more precise analysis and storage.

Regarding claim 15, the teachings of M-G are reviewed above, which imply the conversion of any measuring current into a measuring voltage.

M-G does not explicitly convert the measuring current into a measuring voltage and recognize the material forming the surface from a voltage range in which the measuring voltage lies.

Nakamura teaches the conversion of a measuring current into a measuring voltage (col. 9, line 10 –18) and recognizes the material forming the surface from a voltage range in which the measuring voltage lies (basis of reference voltage, col. 9, line 18-22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used Nakamura's voltage conversion of the measuring current with the sensor electronics of M-G for the express purpose of recognizing the material forming the surface from a voltage range in which the measuring voltage lies, with the benefit of an efficient use of the comparator.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claim 17 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, along with the omitted intervening step of "converting the measuring current into a measuring voltage," as indicated in the first Office Action.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: A method for detecting a material of a surface of a flat object on a stack of flat objects being printing plates, which are separated by interlayers using sensor electrodes resting on the surface of the flat object and connected to sensor electronics for conducting a measuring current through the surface of the flat object; converting the measuring current into a measuring voltage and evaluating measuring voltages determined from the plurality of measurements to detect the material of the surface for distinguishing between the printing plates and the interlayers before providing the printing plates for further processing, has not been found in the prior art.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 9 and 12 – 18 based on the Margolin reference have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments regarding item 2 on page 2 are persuasive. Therefore, the objection to claim 4 is withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments regarding item 3 on page 3 are persuasive. Therefore, the objection to method claim 12, which would have introduced an additional method step that carries patentable weight, is withdrawn.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2858

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Hu (6,168,687) teaches a method for sheet measurement and control.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas F. Valone whose telephone number is 571-272-8896. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Diane Lee can be reached on 571-272-2399. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Thomas Valone, PhD, PE
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2858
571-272-8896



DIANE LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER